



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,325	08/13/2001	Stephen Paul Denis		7924

7590 08/11/2003  
STEPHEN P. DENIS  
P. O. BOX 6  
THERMAL, CA 92274

EXAMINER

RHEE, JANE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/928,325

Applicant(s)

DENIS, STEPHEN PAUL

Examiner

Jane J Rhee

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Alexander.

Alexander discloses a cover for protecting fruits comprising a bag substantially oblong (col. 3 line 59) made of a woven open mesh polyester (col. 4 line 43 and figure 1 number 20) that is resistant to deterioration from exposure to prolonged sunlight (col. 4 lines 37-38), allows air to flow through (col. 4 line 39) and has a means for anchoring the top of the bag to the fruitstalk of bunch (figure 3 number 34). Alexander discloses that the protective quantities are not limited to round fruit (col. 4 line 8-9) and that the size of the bag may be varied to accommodate any fruit or vegetable (col. 5 line 10-11). The polyester fabric that Alexander discloses is water repellent and UV resistant to a certain degree as to all fabrics in general.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1772

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2 and 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander.

Alexander discloses a cover for protecting fruits comprising a bag made of a woven open mesh polyester (col. 4 line 43 and figure 1 number 20) that is resistant to deterioration from exposure to prolonged sunlight (col. 4 lines 37-38), allows air to flow through (col. 4 line 39) and has a means for anchoring the top of the bag to the fruitstalk of bunch (figure 3 number 34). Alexander discloses that the protective quantities are not limited to round fruit (col. 4 line 8-9) and that the size of the bag may be varied to accommodate any fruit or vegetable (col. 5 line 10-11). The polyester fabric that Alexander discloses is water repellent and UV resistant to a certain degree as to all fabrics in general. Alexander fail to disclose that the fabric has a weight of 86-113 grams per square meter and that the cloth count of approximately 13 warps by 10 fills per square centimeter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to have provided Alexander with the fabric that has a weight of 86-113 grams per square meter and a cloth count of approximately 13 warps by 10 fills per square centimeter, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Alexander limits his invention to a bag substantially globular in shape and that he never states nor implies in the specification that the bag is made of an open mesh material, Alexander in col. 3 line 59 disclosed that in previous prior arts, oblong bags are very well known in the art. As to the limitation of "open mesh material", Alexander does disclose an open mesh material which allows free circulation of air throughout the fruit cluster, yet excludes insects and birds, provides a windbreak and partially shades the bunch (col. 4 lines 38-41).

In response to applicant's argument that a person skilled in the art of protection maturing fruits and vegetables from low temperatures would never provided Alexander with a fabric that has a weight of 86-113 grams per square meter and a cloth count of approximately 13 warps by 10 fills per square centimeter, since such a fabric has no insulation quality, Alexander discloses that the invention is not designed to protect fruits and vegetables in the event of a hard freeze because of its air and water permeability (col. 3 lines 28-31). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of protection maturing fruits and vegetables to obtain a less dense fabric such as a fabric that has a weight of 86-113 grams per square meter and a cloth count of approximately 13 warps by 10 fills per square centimeter for protecting fruits in warmer weather.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jane J Rhee whose telephone number is 703-605-4959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 703-308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Jane Rhee  
July 30, 2003

  
NASSER AHMAD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Acting SPE